

F 685
.P51
Copy 1

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL O. PEYTON,
OF KENTUCKY.

ON

THE KANSAS QUESTION;

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 25, 1858.

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE.
1858.



SPEECH.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. PEYTON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In coming before the committee to-day to present my views upon a question which has been discussed for many days, I labor under considerable embarrassment; but, in what I have to say in regard to this question, I shall give you my views frankly and candidly, and the reasons why I am in favor of the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution.

In order to make up a fair and just opinion on this question, it is absolutely necessary to trace up its history and origin; and to take not only the recorded evidence, but the under current, got from newspaper reports and conversations had with various persons, and bring all in as auxiliary testimony. I admit that this question is complicated; that it admits of doubt; and I think that the only way to arrive at a just conclusion in this matter, is to lay aside all party prejudices, and examine it with scrutiny, carefully and honestly. I have no doubt that thus we can come to a just conclusion in regard to it.

Now, sir, ten years ago I was a member of this House. After the passage of the Missouri compromise in 1820, peace and tranquillity were restored to the country. But, growing out of the Mexican war, we had acquired a large extent of territory. A question then sprang up as to what disposition should be made of that acquisition. The northern men said that no slavery existed in that territory, and that they never would give a vote to extend slavery into territory then free. The southern men said: "We contributed our share of men and money in the acquisition of this territory. The bones of our sons, who died to acquire it, now bleach upon the plains of Mexico; and we ask to have a fair participation in its benefits." The North refused; and the gentleman now in the chair, and others around me, well recollect the struggle that followed at the close of Polk's administration.

That was the spirit that pervaded the North.

The southern men found out that, although northern men were willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with them and fight the battles of the country, yet, if territory were acquired by their joint blood and treasure, the South would be excluded from that territory. Then it was that alarm spread through the country. The siege of Ashland and the statement of that day came forth from their homes and settled that great question. And how was it settled? The Democrats of the North, while many of them entertained the opinion that Congress had power to exclude slavery from the Territory, agreed that it was unjust to the South to do so; and they were willing that both southern and northern men should go into the Territory, and settle there as friends and neighbors; and, when they came to form a State government, they should take the vote, and slavery should be recognized or excluded, according to the will of the majority. That was fair and just. But no sooner had that bill passed, than there was a storm raised in the North in opposition to it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, in 1854, Congress met; and, inasmuch as a portion of that territory which was governed by the Missouri compromise had been taken to make up the territory governed by the compromise of 1850, Congress repealed the Missouri restriction, and applied, in 1854, the same principle that had been applied in 1850.

What then occurred, Mr. Chairman? Did parties all submit to the will of the majority, and agree faithfully and honestly to abide by the law of Congress? Not so, sir. An organization sprang up into existence at the moment. That organization contributed men and money; the avowed object being to send men into Kansas, to maintain them there, and to get them to vote slavery out of the Territory.

Now, sir, in all sorts of difficulties it is a matter of the first importance to find out who was the aggressor—who was wrong in the beginning. I do not care how pure and patriotic were the motives of the association; for they sent into the Territory men who, if they were not bad men when they started, became bad after they got

there. They were clothed, and fed, and maintained by the society, under the pledge that they would vote to make the Territory free.

Now, what was the natural consequence? What would any other State, situated as Missouri is, have done? The report spread all through the State of Missouri that Massachusetts was sending men into the Territory by hundreds, to make that Territory free. The people of Missouri thereupon determined to go there, and stand around the polls, and see that their friends had an opportunity to vote. The idea had gone out in Missouri that the free-State men in the Territory would take possession of the polls, and prevent pro-slavery men from voting. Well, the Missourians went into the Territory, and stood around the polls, and some of them, I have no doubt, voted. The great bulk of them, however, merely stood around the polls, with their rifles in their hands; kept off the marauders, and allowed their friends to vote.

Now, I say there was a majority of pro-slavery men in the Territory of Kansas, at the first election; and, as evidence of that fact, I refer to the census. A registry was taken, and there was a clear and decided majority of three, or four, or five hundred votes of pro-slavery men in that Territory. Another proof of that fact is, that the Governor of the Territory—the only official authority that we have to speak from in relation to that matter—said that, although there was fraudulent voting, yet that a majority of the delegates to the Legislature were elected without fraud; and, therefore, he unhesitatingly gave the certificates to a majority.

What next followed? That Legislature was recognized; a Delegate was elected and took his seat here; and, from that day to this, Congress, the President of the United States, and the people of the Territory of Kansas, except those who refused to submit to the laws, recognized that Territorial Legislature as legal and binding.

What next occurred? That Territorial Legislature passed a law, authorizing the people to vote for, or against, a convention to frame a State constitution; and all the people concurred in the opinion that they ought to have such a convention. A free-State paper there, the *Kansas Herald*, said that the people all voted on that occasion, and that there was no opposition to the calling of the convention. Delegates were nominated and elected, and the convention was to meet on the 21st of September to form a State constitution.

The free-State party, if they had the majority their friends claim, should have gone to the polls and elected delegates to form just such a constitution as they desired. If they did not vote it was their own fault. The pro-slavery party, as they had a perfect right to do, elected all their candidates; and, in obedience to the wishes of their friends, they framed a constitution and submitted it to the people. They were elected in June. Governor Walker, who had then been sent into the Territory, called on the free-State men to come forward and vote. He went through the Territory and made speeches; he begged and implored them to take part in the election; he told them that the peace and prosperity of the Territory, in a great measure, depended upon them; he told them that if they would come forward and vote, and if they had the majority, and would go on and form a

State government, he had no doubt Congress would be liberal to them, and would give them liberal grants of the public lands; and that they would do a deed that would entitle them to the gratitude of the American people. But, mark you, he told them that if they stood off, and refused to vote, the persons who did come forward and vote would elect their candidates; and those who did not vote would delegate the power to those who did to vote for them, and they would be bound by the action of the delegates elected.

Now, it is alleged that there was a fault in the registry; that some nineteen counties were disfranchised; and that the persons living in those counties were not permitted to take part in the election. Mr. Chairman, what is the fact in regard to this charge? The officers executed their duty faithfully. They registered every man they could get to register. But in three or four of the counties the people would not give their names. They threatened violence to the officers, and drove them from the counties. Others gave fictitious names. Then, sir, it was their own fault that they were not registered.

But, sir, everywhere in the counties where the registry was completed there was a large majority in favor of the constitution. There were nine thousand two hundred and odd voters registered in the Territory, and some two or three thousand voted at that election. Taking the doctrine that is admitted here on all sides, that those who did not vote authorized those who did to vote for them, and the fact that a majority of those who did vote voted for the constitution, it makes no difference what was the number, the election was binding on all. It is to be taken for granted that those who did not vote were either indifferent or were perfectly satisfied to let those who did take the trouble to vote, vote for all.

But, Mr. Chairman, there can be no dispute as to the fairness of the election in the counties where the registry was completed. Now take the vote that was polled on the 4th of January last, in which our friends on the other side of the House say ten thousand two hundred votes were cast—my own judgment is that they did not cast any such vote; but taking it for granted that they did cast that number of votes, and still nine thousand and odd of that number were cast in the counties that were registered. But unless you can show that a majority of the people were left out of the registry, unless you can prove that in those counties where there was no registry taken there were voters enough to have changed the result, then the election was valid and binding.

No intelligent man will believe that the sixty-seven hundred voters who voted for the constitution on the 21st of December, voted against it on the 4th of January after. More than half the votes polled against the constitution on the 4th of January were fraudulent, clearly and palpably fraudulent. On the same day they elected all their State officers, but could poll only about four or five thousand votes; for the reason that the Leecompton party had also candidates in the field, and guarded the ballot-box so far as the election of State officers was concerned. They looked upon the vote against the constitution, taken on the 4th of January by different officers, as entirely illegal and void; and therefore did not care whether they polled ten thousand or twenty thousand.

But our northern friends tell us, "Do you want to cram a constitution down the throats of the people against their will?" I answer that I have no such wish. But, sir, when a community settles in a Territory they must have some law by which they are to be governed; they must have some rules and regulations to go by. If a portion of them desire peace and harmony and good government, and another portion desire disturbance, and will submit to no law, I say that all law-abiding men in this House and in the country should strengthen and encourage the men there who desire and are seeking to establish law and order. Now, sir, what would be the condition of a community where a large portion of the people were standing out, marauding and depredating continually upon the community, and who were against all law? Is it not the duty of every man who desires the peace and harmony of the country to encourage and sustain the men there who are striving to maintain peace and good order? And will we not, by rejecting this constitution, give encouragement to those men who have stood out in open rebellion against the Government for the last three years?

Well, sir, the delegates to this convention were elected. They went on and made a constitution, and submitted the great paramount issue, slavery, to the people for their ratification or rejection. Is it to be thrown back upon these marauding and law-defying people? Mr. Chairman, if these men had been correct, straightforward, honest men, when Governor Walker told them to come forward and vote—that they should be protected in their rights at the ballot-box; that he had troops there to protect the polls; that if they had the majority they could make just such a constitution as they chose; that if they did not vote, the pro-slavery party would elect their delegates, and they would be bound by the result—I say, if they had been honest, correct men, why did they not come forward and vote? Why, sir, they never wanted a constitution. The object of that party, from the very moment they landed in Kansas, was to keep up a political excitement, instead of making a constitution, or abiding by wholesome laws. They came there to rob, and some of them to murder. I do not charge the party which sent them there with any improper motive. I make the charge against the men who were sent there. The party were not particular who were sent, to be sure. The emigrant aid societies raised the funds, and all who were willing to go were sent. Hence, the worst men, perhaps, men out of employment and of desperate characters, were forwarded to Kansas—the very men, sir, disposed to keep up a continual disturbance of the public peace. Yet grave legislators tell us these men are good, law-abiding citizens! They were refused the right of suffrage; and therefore the constitution should be again referred back to them, that they may vote upon it.

Now, sir, what authority have we for thinking that if the constitution be referred back, they will make a better one? They have been at it for three years already. We have Governor Reeder's statement that they promised him to cease marauding and disturbing the peace, and abide by the ballot-box; and we have, too, the proof that they were faithless to that promise. Notwithstanding all this, that the Legislature which au-

thorized the convention was legally elected, the delegates to the convention legally elected by a large majority of those who saw proper to vote on that occasion, we are now implored by these men to reject the Kansas constitution, because, they say, there is a majority of the people opposed to it. I deny that any gentleman can show that there ever was a majority of votes cast against the Leecompton constitution, counting out all fraudulent votes claimed, from the first election of delegates to frame it, until it was finally ratified by the people. Although the free-State party elected a majority of members to the Legislature in October, according to Calhoun's proclamation, and gave ten thousand two hundred votes against the constitution on the 4th of January, the majority report of the Committee on Territories, when compared with the report of the minority, show clearly that there was fraudulent voting.

Take these reports and examine them. You will find, of the whole vote polled against the Leecompton constitution in January, ninety-six hundred were polled in the registered counties, where the census showed that there were but ninety-two hundred and fifty voters, and where sixty-seven hundred had been given in favor of the constitution on the 21st of December previous; and in these same counties the free-State party only gave for State officers, at the same election, some four or five thousand. There is strong evidence going to show that they carried over from the county of Lawrence, where they had a large surplus, to Leavenworth, and voted them in that county, and thus carried the State elections.

Mr. Chairman, let us examine this constitution. "Oh!" say our friends around us, "it should have been submitted." They say that when the people were called upon to vote, they were called to vote for the constitution with slavery, or for the constitution without slavery; and that the only question submitted was, whether the people should raise slaves without importation of new ones, or whether they should raise them and import them too. That is an unfair statement of the question. I think the convention acted more prudently than they would have done if they had followed the advice of Governor Walker. What did he tell them? He said: "Gentlemen, go on and form your constitution; make it free; protect what slaves are in the Territory, and I have no doubt in the world but that it will be adopted by a large majority of the people of Kansas." What did they do? They followed Governor Walker's advice, except in one particular. They could not take upon themselves the responsibility of making it a free State; but they would do precisely as Governor Walker recommended. They would make stringent provisions to protect what slaves were in the Territory. They would allow the men who owned slaves to be protected in their rights. What then? Then, said they, instead of making it free, they would submit the slavery clause to the people. If the people struck out that slavery clause, then what? Then, that it should be a free State, with the exception that the slaves in the Territory should belong to their masters until compensation was paid for them by the Legislature. I ask if there is any solitary free-State man, who has any idea of doing justice to the South, who would be in favor of taking the two or three hundred negroes there without compensation? What would be the

consequence? It would raise a storm much more dangerous and perilous than the admission or rejection of the Lecompton constitution would raise; for the southern men who went there with their slaves, under the Constitution of the United States, never expected to surrender them without compensation. It would be unjust to take them unless compensation were made. It would be as much an act of injustice as if the slaves of Kentucky were set free by this Government without compensation.

What did this Lecompton constitution say? Look at it as you please, and slavery is the only question of controversy which is involved. Strike slavery out of the Lecompton constitution, and there would be no objection on the part of those who now oppose it. If there had been no slavery question, there would have been no trouble about Kansas. If those men of the North had wanted to do what was strictly right, and to make Kansas a free State, they would, in my judgment, have come forward and voted the slavery clause out. The Legislature had authority, by paying their owners a fair price for them, to emancipate the slaves that would be then left in the Territory. As just men, as men who desired peace, as men who desired to live in harmony with their neighbors and brethren, ought they not to have come forward at first, and voted against the slave clause? Then pass a gradual emancipation law, as has been done in other States, or a law to pay the owners a fair price for their slaves, which they had a right to do under the constitution, and thus make it a free State.

But what are you now called upon to do? You are called upon to turn round and say that those men who have refused from the start to submit to law, who have organized their forces, and have their captains, their lieutenants, and other officers, that those men who have threatened and forced the free-State Democrats to join them by abusing them and their wives, and threatening to drive them out of the Territory unless they joined them—I say you are called upon to say that that party is right, and that the constitution should have been submitted to them, and that they should have had the opportunity to say whether they were in favor of that constitution or not. That is not, Mr. Chairman, the way, in my judgment, in which a good government can be carried on. The object of law always is to protect the weak from the encroachments of the strong and the vicious. Here is a party—and there is no denying it—with a military leader. He has his men, and they have decidedly the advantage of the Federal troops. The Federal troops have only the right to fight when necessary; but they have no right to vote. But General Lane and his men have both the right to fight and to vote. But they prefer to do neither. They kept up a great parade, kept themselves marshaled, and sallied out at one time to disturb one neighborhood; but as soon as they knew that the Federal troops were ordered out to punish them, they would be suddenly found in another place. Their whole object and aim from the beginning was to keep up a continual disturbance in the Territory—not to vote, nor to organize a peaceable government there, but to keep that country in continual turmoil.

Now, the newspapers in Kansas and in the northern States were filled with statements that

the people of Kansas were down-trodden; that they were suffering wonderful afflictions from the border-ruffians; that they had been driven from the polls; and that they were denied the right of suffrage. What was the effect? The effect was to arouse a feeling of revenge in the bosoms of northern men. At the North they heard but one side, and that was that the people who had gone to Kansas from the North were down-trodden and abused; and hence it was that they were for seeing them placed right.

Mr. Chairman, there is a radical difference between the Democrats who stand upon the Kansas-Nebraska bill and the Republicans. The Republicans come out very boldly and honestly—and I look upon the great mass of them as being as honest as anybody—and tell us that if Kansas were to come here by a very large majority of the *bona fide* voters of that Territory, with a constitution tolerating slavery, they would not admit her; that they look upon slavery as a moral and political evil, and that they do not intend to vote for the admission of another slave State. Well, I do not know what that course will lead to, but it is frank and open, and I admire it. But what do our Democrats say? In 1856 we met at Cincinnati, and united upon a set of principles—a platform—one main feature of which was, that Kansas should have the right to regulate her own social and domestic institutions, slavery included, in her own way. The presidential canvass was opened; and the Democrats of the North came forward, and upon every stump they repudiated the idea that the Legislature of Kansas was not a legal Legislature. They spurned with contempt the reports then circulated, that Kansas was down-trodden and oppressed by the slave power. They said that this matter was all a political trick; that it was all intended to open anew the wounds of bleeding Kansas in order to elect Fremont; that it was to excite the passions of the free-State people and to induce them to believe that the people of the South had been doing injustice, and all this was done to enable the North to elect their Republican candidate.

But what do some of the northern Democrats say now? They turn round and say that they were mistaken; that those men in Kansas were meek, and gentle, and pure men—just as pure as they make men in Massachusetts; that they had been raised and educated in that city of morals and religion, Boston; that when they left Massachusetts they were as pure as they could be. But it seems to me there was an innate diabolical disposition in their hearts, and as soon as they were brought into contact with the border ruffians they became more devilish than the border ruffians themselves. From the moment they entered the Territory they have kept up one continual disturbance, refusing to go to the polls to vote when called upon to do so. They were unwilling to take any constitution except the one which they made at Topeka; and that, too, in defiance of law. Now their friends come forward and say, “do not let us admit Kansas under this constitution; it does not embody the will of the majority.” How are we to ascertain that will? If there are ten thousand voters in Kansas, and six thousand of them refuse to vote on any occasion, how can you find out that the four thousand who have voted do not express the will of the majority? It

is a very common thing in some counties, where there is no contest, that men are elected by less than a one-third vote; and in a close contest in States and counties, the men elected, nine times out of ten, do not get a majority of the votes of the State or county. There are always a number of voters who do not go to the polls; and if their votes were cast against the successful candidate, he would be defeated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what injurious effect would follow the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution? Some men say that the people there can alter their constitution before 1864, and others say they cannot. I am no lawyer, and do not propose to investigate that legal question. All I have to say is this: if they have the constitutional and legal right to alter it, let them alter it. If they cannot, let them submit. This thing was not thrown upon them suddenly. They were fully advised of the consequences by Walker and Stanton; and they were told that if they refused to vote they must take the consequences. They did refuse to vote. The convention met and the constitution was framed. That constitution is now presented. Congress ought, in my opinion, as an act of justice, leaving out the technicalities of law, to admit Kansas under that constitution. I must confess to you that I have but little sympathy for a party that stands out stubbornly, and refuses to abide by the law; and I am perfectly astonished at my Democratic friends who come forward and preach up the purity and honesty of those whom, in 1856, they denounced as traitors and rebels.

The question is not so much as to whether Kansas should be a free State or a slave State. But will our northern friends admit another slave State into this Union? That is the question. If we are to be insulted, degraded, and equality in this Confederacy denied us, we want to know it. The South should have confidence in the North; the North should have confidence in the South; they should have confidence that each would do justice to the other. In 1856, when we were in conflict with the American party, we told them that their whole party in the North was abolitionized, and that, if the South expected to get justice she must look to the Democratic party North. We held up the State conventions of the Democratic party, and the speeches of their leaders, in which they stated that they intended to stand by the principle of non-intervention, by the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and that they regarded that act as just in all its parts.

Now, what did our friends of the American party say on that occasion? They said to us, your northern Democrats are promising very fairly, but you will see how they will carry out those promises if the people of Kansas recognize slavery in their constitution. They said that when our Democratic friends came to be called upon to vote on that constitution, the South would not have the support of a corporal's guard. We confidently believed otherwise; and I confidently believe still, that we have enough patriotism and love of country left in the ranks of the Democracy to carry this question. We have lost some friends whose loss I regret exceedingly. The influence of that loss will be serious in the southern States. So far as party is concerned, it would be ten thousand times better that Kansas should be rejected

without Democratic votes. Some of our friends are disposed to look upon these brother Democrats of ours, who vote against Lecompton, as having joined the Republicans. My judgment is, that we will have a hard fight in 1860 with the Republicans, and that we will need every one of these Democrats to help us. I am opposed to turning one of them out; I fear that some of them will go out themselves; but so far as I am concerned I am in favor of keeping every one of them that I can keep. My honest opinion about these Democrats is, that when they come to examine the whole ground in regard to this Lecompton constitution, if they believe that there has been fraud and wrong, and that there has been a gross violation of right in getting up this Lecompton constitution, it is their duty to vote against it. But before they cast their votes against it, there should not rest on their minds one solitary doubt as to the propriety of their course. They must be fully satisfied. They must make up their minds not as partisans and politicians. I know that when the Democratic party parts with a brother Democrat, it does so with reluctance. We have stood shoulder to shoulder; have fought the battle and won it; and it is with feelings of deep mortification and regret that we are compelled to part with them. But before they do vote against us, I ask them to examine the whole history of this matter candidly and impartially; to lay aside all outside issues; and then, if they believe that there has been a violation of right and of justice, it is their duty, I repeat, as honest men, to vote against this Lecompton constitution. Their act will make a serious impression upon us at the South. But, sir, mixed up with evils there is always some good. When we go home and commence talking about this question, and when northern Democrats are held up to derision, and their vote cast in our teeth, we can point to southern gentlemen in this House and say that we had not made all right at home; and that before we say a solitary word against northern Democrats, we ought to see that we ourselves present a solid and compact column. We should first make pure our own household before we turn round and criticise our neighbor's.

That is all I shall say on this point, for I am not at all accustomed to addressing public assemblies. I have never before addressed a legislative body in my life. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not make up my mind on this subject until I had given it a most thorough scrutiny; until I had viewed it in all its aspects calmly and dispassionately. That scrutiny has led me to the conclusion that it is right and just; that the interests of the American people require the admission of Kansas into the Union, in order to restore peace and quiet to that Territory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you refuse to settle this Kansas difficulty at this time, what will be the result? This Topeka party will, in all probability, have the ascendancy, and they will liberate every solitary slave in the Territory. What then? Do you suppose these Missourians will submit to it? Not at all. They will never submit to it. The troubles of the Territory will begin anew, and be kept up until 1860. The Democratic party now desire to put down the Republican party. They desire to keep a Republican out of the presidential chair in 1860, be-



cause, if he once gets there, there will be danger. If you send this constitution back to Kansas without ratification, there is danger that the excitement may go on until it produces bloodshed and border war; and the difficulty will not be settled before 1860, if then. Admit Kansas into the Union, and what will be the result? There are not a great many negroes there; there will not be a great many there before 1860; and besides that, her Legislature has the right, under the constitution, to pay for the negroes, and then make it a free State. Would it not be a great deal better to contribute thus; would it not be better to raise the necessary funds, even by contributions? I myself would contribute towards the purchase of the slaves who are there, if they want to make it a free State. That is the way to make peace in the country.

The constitution which we have before us is just in all its features. It is a good constitution. The only difficulty about it is the slavery question. But, if there is not a majority of the people there in favor of slavery they are not going to have slavery there. This constitution cannot force slavery upon a free people if they do not want it; nor can they make a Territory or State free if its people want slaves. The only way, in my judgment, to restore peace in Kansas is to admit her into the Union with her constitution, and then allow the people there to settle their affairs in their own way. The moment you give her a constitution, and leave the people to take care of themselves, they will regulate their own affairs, and peace and quiet will be restored. If they want a free State, they will make it free. If they want a slave State, there is no power in the North or in Congress to make it free. The great question upon which the South insists with so much pertinacity is this: Democrats of the North, will you vote to admit a State into the Union with a constitution recognizing slavery? Satisfy the South that you will do justice by her, and God forbid that we should ask for more. If they could be assured that you do not vote against the admission of Kansas into the Union because the constitution has slavery in it, they would be satisfied.

But, Mr. Chairman, at this moment this intelligence goes forth over our land, and our men will say that northern Democrats have refused the constitution of Kansas because it had slavery in it. They will go upon the soap and vindicate the South against the usurpation. They can show more facts why Kansas should have been admitted than any man can show why she should not be admitted. The South is already united upon this question; she marches in a solid column.

I say, therefore, to northern Democrats, that unless you believe it is your imperious duty, unless you can see clearly that there has been fraud, unless you can see that the will of an honest people has been violated—for if they be a dishonest people they have no rights—I say, that unless you can see clearly that the will of the law-abiding, honest people has been overriden, do not reject this constitution. If you do so believe, then you must vote as your duty requires.

In regard to my Republican friends, all I have to say is just this: my own judgment about the whole matter is, that you men of the North are not really so solicitous whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State as you are about the loaves and fishes—as you are about the election of the President of the United States. But, if you do not design the final and speedy overthrow of this Government, what, I ask, are you doing? It is apparent to everybody who looks over this House, that you are sowing the seeds of discord among our people. There is now, between the North and South, a feeling of distrust; a want of confidence; a belief that the North is not prepared to do the South justice. If you continue to go on and nourish this feeling—if you widen the breach, it will, before many years, grow into hate. Now, sir, the stability of our Government is dependent upon the affections of the American people, and upon their intelligence. Destroy the affection of the people for the Government, excite jealousy and distrust between the North and South, and I tell you there is not power or patriotism enough in the Union to hold the Government together.

[Here the hammer fell.]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 016 088 971 8